

From: [David Cooper](#)
To: [Dana Barton](#)
Cc: [Luis Garcia-Bakarich](#)
Subject: Fw: TASC Request - denied in favor of workgroup being only voice heard
Date: 06/02/2010 07:45 AM
Attachments: [pra_tasc.pdf](#)

Dana --

This is one of two e-mails I received on this subject. I didn't realize that you weren't copied, since so many were.

I would definitely note the fourth para which substantiates Luis' and my claim about Dan's statement in our phone conversation with him last year when Craig, Luis and I told him that we were going to hold an informational meeting on TASC. I should note that the TASC meeting was not, as has been repeatedly claimed, a formal needs assessment meeting because we'd been limited in our scope by internal EPA management/program decisions. I believe that I forwarded a voicemail to you last week from Craig where he informed me that Christina is again requesting TASC.

-- Dave

----- Forwarded by David Cooper/R9/USEPA/US on 06/02/2010 07:33 AM -----

From: cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org
To: Michael Montgomery/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Brian \ (CA-24\) Miller" <bjmiller@mail.house.gov>, Craig Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, David Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Gregg Dempsey/LV/USEPA/US@EPA, Jane Diamond/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, LISA PINTO <Lisa.Pinto@mail.house.gov>, Nicole Moutoux/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, RBrusch@dtsc.ca.gov
Date: 06/02/2010 07:10 AM
Subject: TASC Request - denied in favor of workgroup being only voice heard

Dear Mr. Montgomery,
 The request for TASC support should not have any bearing on whether the EPA chooses to "support the workgroup" based on requests from Congressional Staff, I cannot imagine that EPA is interpreting such a request to mean refusing to provide independent technical support to our community? Did Congress actually ask you to make sure this community only has one voice and one source for information? and that it not be EPA but rather one individual? These sound like objectives for one individual, and not for several surrounding communities of one of the earliest nuclear accidents on U.S. soil.

This partial nuclear meltdown has gone largely unnoticed by our federal and state governments until State DTSC Project Director Mr. Norman Riley, who in his short involvement, was finally able to secure a Consent Order signed by ALL responsible parties to move forward with real investigation and clean-up despite the inaction and federal finger-pointing that has gone on for decades despite the existence of a "workgroup" for over twenty years. Now, it appears that no one is adhering to the law, including the regulators themselves.

Isn't EPA and Congress charged with representing citizen(s) and that we all should have a voice, when we are the ones being affected? Mr. Hirsch lives closer to Sacramento than to this community for good reason: His objectives are politically driven, whereas our community is impacted through public health and we are already here. Your objectives should put us clearly in the front of that line. But instead, we are not afforded a voice in that process where these

politically-driven decisions are being made. Our requests for independent resources of technical expertise have been denied at every turn. This community needs technical expertise for the purpose of scientific analysis so that the issues can be more clearly understood by the larger community that is impacted. In fact, that is exactly what this diverse community needs.

I have attached a document which I received through a public records act request, which shows that the promise that our communities multiple TASC requests will "never go anywhere" are strictly to protect Mr. Hirsch's stage show (workgroup), rather than providing this much needed benefit to our community who has been impacted for half a century with very little action resulting in clean-up.

We who live in the communities below the site, are not interested in stretching this out for decades more for political benefit. Time is part of the factor that brings toxic and nuclear exposure into our lives. The number of people who live within a few miles of the site today, has grown from a few thousand when it began, to closer to 50,000 residents considering the 5-mile impact in all directions from the site, and we are being excluded from the process by refusing to allow for any other voices to be heard.

Is Mr. Hirsch right? that our requests to EPA will never go anywhere as long as he says so?

This is very disturbing and disappointing for our communities who have waited for so long for some real help and real answers as rainy seasons come and go, draining down into our communities year after year. I await your clarifying response.

Sincerely,
Christina Walsh
cleanuprocketdyne.org
8189225123

Quoting Montgomery.Michael@epamail.epa.gov:

> Thank You Christina -
>
> We have been recently hearing and receiving a lot of feedback around the
> workgroup. We will discuss this with Congressional staff and work with
> the State to come up with some suggestions which I would hope we could
> share with you and others in the near future. We are in a difficult
> position as we have been asked by Congressional reps to continue
> supporting the workgroup even though the State is the lead agency. I want
> you to know that we take the concerns of community regarding transparency
> and democratic processes very seriously.
>
> Michael M. Montgomery, Assistant Director
> Federal Facilities and Site Cleanup Branch
> U.S. EPA Region IX
> (415) 972-3438
> montgomery.michael@epa.gov



From: Daniel O Hirsch <cbghirsch@aol.com>
To: Rick Brausch <RBrausch@dtsc.ca.gov>, Louise Rishoff <Louise.Rishoff@asm....>
Date: 5/26/2009 10:28 AM
Subject: busy SSFL week

G'Day,

Hope you had a restful holiday weekend. This coming week looks pretty full:

1. Tonight (Tuesday): EPA TASC mtg [6:30-9 pm Radisson Hotel, 9777 Topanga Canyon Blvd., Chatsworth], likely to be heated

Chris Rowe requested that EPA provide her with a technical advisor through the Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) program. Rowe said the community was unduly concerned about risks from radiation and chemicals at the site, wanted the cleanup standards in 990 which she believes should be dramatically relaxed, and asked for a technical advisor who could help counter public concerns.

EPA promised me Rowe's request would not go anywhere; and if EPA were to even consider such a TASC grant, would not do so without substantial consultation with and OK by the community more generally. Once again, it broke its word.

We had to read in an EPA newsletter that EPA had gone ahead and granted the Rowe request and had chosen a TASC consultant; had scheduled a meeting in the community for Tuesday night to introduce the TASC consultant that had been chosen for the community. This meeting was called without consulting with the community and over vociferous subsequent objections.

The community is furious; doesn't trust EPA or the TASC consultant; had no say in the matter. It may be a difficult meeting.

2. Wednesday: Rowe has called a meeting of the Santa Susana Mountains Advisory Committee, a committee of the West Hills Neighborhood Council, for 7 pm, Fairwinds Retirement Center, 8138 Woodlake Avenue, West Hills. I have forwarded to you separately her email and the agenda.

You will note:

(a) Although GSA has to date declined the state's requests to meet and discuss its plans for the transfer of SSFL land, it is sending a representative, along with NASA representatives, to Rowe's 5 person-committee to discuss the matter.

DOE and DTSC are also scheduled to make presentations on other subjects, and Boeing generally attends. Obviously there is an attempt by the RPs to use this tiny committee as a de facto CAG.

(b) Rowe proposes the committee vote to:

(i) call for formation of a Community Advisory Group (CAG), and

(ii) call for changes to the membership of the Inter-Agency Work Group.

These resolutions, if passed, would then go to the W. Hills Neighborhood Council the following Wednesday for a vote.

Christina Walsh is very angry that the agencies are meeting with Rowe's group but not hers. NASA has subsequently agreed to meet with Christina Walsh's folks Wednesday mornig, but without GSA.

3. Thursday: SSFL InterAgency Work Group, 6:30-10 pm, Simi Valley Cultural Arts Center, 3050 Los Angeles Avenue, Simi.

Rick, who is going to make the DTSC presentations, and has the content been worked out in advance?

GSA and NASA will be there to present on the land transfer; it is important that the state's position be clearly enunciated.

There will be discussion of the consent order process, following up on the discussion at the previous meeting about it being made secret. DOE will present and NASA, and the whole issue of the contradictory statements made about compliance with 990. The regular facilitator Marie Rainwater will not be there, and the EPA staffer who will substitute for her, David Cooper, is pretty new to the project and may not be able to make this all good relatively smoothly.

4. Friday: Secretary Adams tour of SSFL.

Is it confirmed for 1 pm? Have the participants been confirmed? Am I to go, and if so, will I be permitted to point things out to her on the tour, or will it be a Boeing show?

Will she be able to meet privately with Holly, Dawn, and Marie? If so, when?

5. The big gorilla in the room: where do things stand regarding Congressional action to block the land transfer move?

Would it be useful to have a conf call today or tomorrow to deal with all these matters?

Dan